

It is becoming increasingly clear that Republican news managers have accurately assessed the press and that the press is what amounts to a conscious part of the hiding. For the first time since the beginning of the story the Post this morning has the story in the featured, prime column 8, page 1 top-of-fold position. The head: Stans Scathes Report. The report in question was treated to less prominence, although the Post had at least a local scoop on it, was not repeated in the early editions of the next day's paper although it did not make them the day the story broke, and seems to be unquestionable. It is but one of the many published authentications of Stans' dishonesty. NBC TV Today was even more partisan, Bill Monroe trying persistently and with apparent partisanship rather than news diligence to get Larry O'Brien to say no top GOP was connected with the case.

Buried in the Post story was yesterday's discovery of a tap on a Dem. Hq. phone that had had a tap removed prior to the arrests, the phone of man in charge of relations with state leaders. More than burying it, the Post repeated faithfully all the official and Republican semantics that are so transparent and the reporters surely see through. There is no questioning in signed piece.

The kind of device found yesterday, first by phone-company security people then removed by the FBI, could be more than a tap. It could be a bug from the description. And typically, the Democrats seem to have been entirely unprepared for taking a picture of it. Some accounts given them ample time after its discovery and before FBI removal.

I recall no DC reporting, electronic or printed, of what may have been still another effort at intrusion, reported by Jean Westwood, discovery of some men installing a red box in the wall, their disappearance after discovery and its removal by the FBI. Pacifica had.

O'Brien was on the last ten minutes of the Today show. CBS TV 7 a.m. news had a fair sequence with Daniel ~~Shore~~ ^{Schorn} apparently photographed yesterday. NBC's hourly news at 8 on Today was also fair and straightforward news.

I note an opinion that if this were a new intrusion, it would not be out-of-character for the spook types involved, who might well assume that with the arrests everyone would take for granted there were be no new effort. On the opposite side, if this were an old one after an FBI investigation that included an electronic sweep, that is abundant commentary on the FBI's thoroughness, especially because this Oliver phone had been tapped before. But minimal investigation would have included every phone, the switchboard, all inside lines, tracing to the trunk and examination of the phone company panel (where a simple patch would be an effective tap of the entire switchboard and would involved duplicating lines to another point, a system used by the FBI.).

The Post pretends there is no Star-News and doesn't report with credit or without what it has. Recent example, at least two new comments from Martha Mitchell, rather two stories on, identifying the man who guarded her and pulled the phone from the wall as Steve Kane, now GOP security chief. How to get ahead?

Monroe's covering and partisanship began with his introduction, that they had originally sought a Republican to appear with O'Brien. None appeared. He said of this they "could not make themselves available". This is false and he knew it. Stans, for example, held a press conference yesterday, getting such treatments as today's Post from its obvious falsehood. It and the rest of current GOP statements and actions are unalloyed Orwell.

O'Brien was kind to the FBI, saying no more than perhaps their investigation was not as thorough as it could have been. He did go further with DJ and Kleindienst, saying they would not let him or lawyers know what it knew and had of what had been intercepted and since this was his own files and records of his own conversations, it interfered with his freedom to do business and personal relationships with leaders, etc.

He volunteered a beautiful example of the press indifference on the story, its lack of digging and dependance upon leaks and handouts. Prior to the arrests and apparently to the first intrusion one of the principals appeared at Dem Hq., introduced himself as the nephew of former chairman Bailey, asked for and got the red-carpet tour, including a pretendedly sentimental request to be able to see the office his "uncle" had used. There, O'B said, he took a really good look. The use to which this was put is obvious. O'B cited it as an example of the "arrogance" of those involved. Monroe was interested but not interested enough to ask which of the men. I suggest it could not have been a Cuban, hence was a high GOP official, like Liddy, or a White House employee, Hunt. McCord would appear to be too old to be Bailey's nephew, but not necessarily so. (It is possible there are others whose

(in the D/act case, Reno)

names have not appeared and who are Anglos. It is certain there were others.)

I believe that any reporter speaking to O'Brien, who is always available, could have had this story and would not rule out the possibility that some did. More, it is traditional that editors look for feature and color stories on such major news stories. Any real effort had to elicit this. Every member of the committee staff and many of their friends and associates as well as many politicians had to know it. But if it appeared, I've neither seen nor heard of it.

During the ten minutes, Monroe made repeated and vigorous efforts to get O'Brien to say that no top people were connected with the affair. With what has been confirmed about Stans yet! There were four such efforts, all at the end, repeated each time O'Brien denied it in one form or another without exposing or insulting Monroe. O'Brien finally said that "a direct line to the White House is emerging" in the case.

This is anything but normal practise and represents protection of the ~~xx~~ Republicans and the White House of a not unconscious nature. In straight news treatment the question itself was inappropriate, more so when presented as an argument, not a question.

CBS radio treatment was to ignore on today's 9 a.m. net news. The vital news not ignored included the filing of a suit in Athens against Onasis for allegedly breaking some plates at a dinner party and the eventless accident to a cargo airliner in which there was no injury. The next 40 minutes on the Post's all-news WTOP radio had no mention of any aspect of the story. At 9:45 there was a rehash, I believe a reuse, of a yesterday's story and no mention of a later yesterday's story, discovery of this tap or bug that is, of course, confirmed and reconfirmed.

Corrections: Today's Post has a magazine-section story by Maxine Cheshire and Donnie Radcliffe on the Martha thing, giving the name as Steve King (Kane on radio two -three days ago) and saying he is "now" security chief. He did the strong-arm work but a doctor gave her the hypo, a tranquilizer. (O'Brien that part I'd not heard of, so I think it was probably a bit stronger and instant reaction was wanted. Phenolbarb as a tranquilizer, for example, is given in the shoulder.) And it seems she has never discussed this incident with John! And they had that LONG chat that led to his resignation, too! On this, for the first time I recall there is the reporting that because of the bugging, "What Martha Mitchell might have known, if anything, led some observers to think that Republicans were anxious to keep her silent". (Js, if you want, ask. I expect Star stories this weekend. They are probably fuller.) The trigger was the Parade story apparently exonerating the security people. (Of whom Shumway "confirmed that King was 'one of a number of people who worked with Mrs. Mitchell to assist her in a security capacity'". This is quite different than the original story at the time of her original Newport Beach outburst, when it was claimed by the same authorities that she had but a single guard.)

Other extreme from Post treatment is that of our local Republican (conservative) paper which uses AP B wire and this a.m. had no story at all. I don't think it is because AP censored the wire and omitted the story entirely.